SAHIDIC. Sahidic (siglum *S*) is a major Coptic dialect, earlier known as Upper Egyptian, Theban, or the southern dialect; the term "Sahidic," used by Athanasius of Qūṣ, was adopted by Stern (1880). In twentieth-century Coptology, *S* has been the main dialect of study and research—indeed Coptic *par excellence*, today totally supplanting BOHAIRIC in this respect (compare, for instance, its precedence in Crum, 1939, to that of Bohairic in Stern, 1880). This

process, virtually complete by 1915 (cf. Erman, 1915, pp. 180f.), may be said to have been initiated by Steindorff's grammar of 1894; yet note early statements favoring Sahidic as "older," "richer," and "purer" (Stern, 1880, p. 1; Sethe, in Kahle, 1954, p. 202), and "magis regularis atque ad analogiam exacta" (Peyron, 1841, p. xix), the earliest observation of its relatively innovating, leveling nature. Indeed, the reputation of *S* as "old," or at least "older" than Bohairic, is due rather to its early documentation and its chronological precedence over Bohairic, which replaced it as the Coptic koine, than to typological fact.

Still the prestige of Sahidic is certainly justified by its rich literature, both original and translated, scriptural and nonscriptural (homiletic, patristic, monastic, Gnostic, magical, poetic), religious and nonreligious (epistolary, documentary, legal, medical). Sahidic was probably the first Coptic dialect into which the Scriptures were translated, apparently in the third century; by the fourth, the translation was completed. Almost all original Coptic literature was written in Sahidic (see ANTONY OF EGYPT, SAINT; PACHOMIUS, SAINT; SHENUTE, SAINT). By the ninth century, *S* had become the official dialect of the Coptic church, but as early as the fourth century, perhaps even earlier, it was a common Pan-Egyptian written literary dialect, spread at least from Heliopolis to Aswan. In subsequent centuries, it completely replaced the minor dialects (*A, L, M*) as a colloquial idiom. By the time of the ARAB CONQUEST OF EGYPT, *S* was the sole literary dialect beside northern Bohairic. From the ninth century onward, *S* gradually receded before Bohairic, a process much accelerated from the eleventh century on.

Sahidic occupies "a position apart from all other dialects" (Polotsky, 1970, p. 560) in that, first, it is "neutral" (Worrell, 1934, p. 73; Kahle, 1954, p. 241) or, better, most leveled, dialectologically speaking; it is the dialect most difficult to characterize distinctively, a "mean" dialect, the one with the fewest exclusive traits and the most isoglosses shared with others. Second, it raises (1) the diachronic, nondescriptive question of its local origin and "proper domain" (the statement by Athanasius of Qūṣ that Sahidic is "the dialect of Miṣr" is not helpful here) and (2) the synchronic question of its integration in the overall dialectological scheme. Question 1 is controversial: Worrell (1934, pp. 68ff.) considered its initial range to have been Oxyrhynchus and the lower valley (his "region IV" or perhaps an area even more northerly); Vergote (1973b, Vol. 1a, pp. 2f.) and Kasser (1980a, pp. 103ff.) suggested it spread southward from around Saqqara-Memphis (perhaps Worrell's "region II"); Polotsky (1970, p. 561) considered Thebes as a possible point of origin. Rather extreme appear Kahle's thesis (1954, pp. 256ff.) tentatively identifying its point of origin in Alexandria, and Schenke's denying Sahidic any original local basis, considering it to be a koine type of idiom born out of contacts, interaction, and leveling of local dialects (1981, pp. 349ff.); Vergote's conception seems to be the most plausible.

In any case, the characterization, still encountered, of Sahidic as "artificial" to a degree is descriptively irrelevant. It is true that standard literary Sahidic is largely "a gift" of the translation of the Bible (and in this sense many literary languages are "artificial") and that Sahidic probably owes its drastic expansion to the progressive suppression of distinctive phenomena. What specific traits Sahidic has, it shares most usually with Akhmimic and Subakhmimic in contrast to Bohairic and Fayyumic. ("Middle Egyptian" really occupies a roughly middle position between the two dialect clusters.) This is, however, no more than an impression and may be proved erroneous by a precise investigation.

Although standard, or "pure," Sahidic is more of a construct, an idealized average, a research *point de repère* than linguistic reality, some varieties of the dialect approach it more closely than others (see below); Sahidic is a *Mischdialekt*, an aggregation of linguistic habits only imperfectly and variously standardized (cf. Mink, 1978, pp. 91ff.; his statement that "die Annahme von Dialekten ist . . . sprachwissenschaftlich ein Konstrukt" is especially cogent when applied to Sahidic). However, extreme cases of "tainting" (e.g., by Fayyumic, Bohairic, Subakhmimic) must be specially treated. The dialect *P*, documented in the Papyrus Bodmer VI text of Proverbs published by Kasser (1960), is held by Vergote (1973a, p. 57) and Kasser (1980a, pp. 62ff.) to be a "protodialect of Sahidic," with non-Sahidic (Theban or Subakhmimic) traits; according to Nagel (1965), it represents early Theban.

1. Standard Sahidic

1.1 Phonology, Morphophonology, and Orthography. As a rule, *S* agrees with Bohairic in points of vocalism, while sharing its consonantism with *A–L*—according to Kasser, in a way reflecting an evolutive scale (see Vergote, 1973b, sec. 60 p. 58, and Kasser, 1981, sec. 25, for lists of "isophones").

1.1.1. Sahidic has no aspirate phonemes: ⲑ, ⲫ, and ⲭ are (in native words) monogram graphemes repre-

senting a combination of two phonemes. (They may have a different standing in the system of Greek-origin phonology.)

1.1.2. Sahidic has only one unvoiced laryngeal spirant (ϩ /h/).

1.1.3. ϫ and ϭ represent distinct phonemes (velopalatal or palatalized stop and alveolar affricate, respectively, ϫⲉ and ϭⲉ, as in ϫⲱ, say, and ϭⲱ, remain).

1.1.4. Sahidic has at least one laryngeal stop phoneme (/X/ = Vergote's and Kasser's /'/), synchronically suprasegmental: "(proneness to) vocalic reduplication." Its distribution is complex (see Satzinger, 1979), with the allophones "zero" (e.g., nonsyllabic /X/ in the final position and pausal junctive: ⲙⲉ, truth) and ⲁ (syllabic, pretonic /X/: ⲧⲁⲙⲟ, inform). In *P*, the laryngeal stop has its own sporadic grapheme (⊥).

1.1.5. In Sahidic there is no progressive sibilant assimilation to /s/ (ⲥⲁⲁⲛϣ̄, make live, nourish), but progressive sibilant assimilation to /c/ does take place (ϣⲁϫⲉ, speak).

1.1.6. Sonorants (/b/, /l/, /m/, /n/, and /r/) closing the tone syllable are graphically "reduplicated," occurring in two neighboring syllables as syllabic and nonsyllabic (onset): ϩⲃ̄ⲃⲉ, plow; ϩⲗ̄ⲗⲟ, old; ⲥⲙ̄ⲙⲉ, report; ⲕⲛ̄ⲛⲉ, be fat; ⲃⲣ̄ⲣⲉ, new.

1.1.7. The Sahidic vowel in the unstressed syllable (after Polotsky, 1933) is outlined in Table 1.

1.1.8. Stressed ⲁ represents the allophone of /o/ before /h/ and /X/ (ⲙ̄ⲕⲁϩ, be pained; ⲧⲃⲁ, ten thousand). In similar prelaryngeal environments, ⲉ represents /a/ (ⲥⲉⲉⲡⲉ, be left over; ϩⲉ, way).

1.1.9. Orthography (see in exhaustive detail Kasser, 1980a). Diagrams: ⲉⲓ, ⲟⲩ. Monograms: ⲑ, ⲫ, ⲭ, ⲋ, ⲯ. ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ, God, is not included among the *nomina sacra* abbreviations. The superlinear stroke occurs above one or more nonvocalic elements, signaling their syllabic phonological status (not their phonetic value or manner of actualization; see Polotsky, 1957a, pp. 221ff., 1971, pp. 227ff.). Proclitic prosodic: relative weakness is fully reflected in the standard orthography; see 1.3.7.

1.2 Morphology (Systemic and Nonsystemic) and Word Formation.

1.2.1. A superficial vocalic *e*-merger of the four converters (ⲉ- circ., ⲉ- second present, ⲛⲉ- preterite, ⲉⲧ(ⲉ)- relative) is characteristic of Sahidic; of these, the first two are actually homonymous. The relative and second perfect forms are not homonymous in the best standard orthography (ⲉⲛⲧ-ⲁ- versus ⲛ̄ⲧ-ⲁ-, respectively); the second perfect may be further circumstantially converted (ⲉ-ⲛ̄ⲧ-ⲁ-; Polotsky, 1957a, pp. 232ff., 1971, p. 232, 1960, sec. 11 obs., e.g., Mt. 20:28 and Eccl. 19:15).

1.2.2. The Sahidic future tense is the extended bipartite ϯⲛⲁⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄; the so-called third future (ⲉϥⲉ-/ⲛ̄ⲛⲉϥ-) is a mode rather than a tense (cf. Polotsky, 1950, pp. 34ff., 1971, pp. 219ff.) and has very limited convertibility (only circ. of the negative base: Polotsky, 1957a, p. 233, 1971, p. 233, 1960, pp. 400, 401, 1971, pp. 246ff.). ⲧⲉⲣⲁ- is a special second-person singular feminine future form.

1.2.3. The *S* conjunctive presuffixal base consists of a nasal (ⲛ̄) and no dental, except for the first-person singular (ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ-, ⲛⲧⲁ-). The conjunctive is in *S* a conjugation form apart, standing midway between the tripartite and bipartite patterns, with ⲛ̄- (prenominally ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ-) marking the modifier status of a nexus of (pro)noun and infinitive; morphologically, this special status is manifested in the pronominal elements, which are (with a single exception in the

TABLE 1.

PRETONIC		POSTTONIC			
FINAL SONORANT	NO SONORANT, INITIAL SONORANT	AFTER CLOSED STRESS SYLLABLE		AFTER OPEN STRESS SYLLABLE	
		INITIAL SONORANT	NO SONORANT, FINAL SONORANT	INITIAL OR FINAL SONORANT	NO SONORANT
Ø	ⲉ	ⲉ	Ø	Ø	Ø
ϣⲣ̄ϣⲱⲣϥ	ⲥⲉⲡⲥⲱⲡϥ	ⲥⲟⲧⲙⲉϥ	ⲥⲟⲧⲡϥ	ⲥⲱⲗⲡ̄	ⲥⲱⲧⲡ̄
	ⲟⲩⲉϭⲟⲩⲱϭϥ	ⲙⲟⲕⲙⲉⲕ	ϣⲟⲣϣⲣ̄	ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄	
		(var. Ø)			
		ϩⲟⲧⲃϥ		(var. ⲉ)	

first singular) identical with the bipartite actor pronouns (prefix pronouns).

1.2.4. ⲧⲁⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ, the causative or "future" conjunctive, a specific postimperative, postinterrogative form with a first singular causation or guarantee seme (Polotsky, 1944, pp. 1ff., 1971, pp. 106ff.), is a typically Sahidic form. The causative infinitive is used as a noncausative "that" form after several prepositions (but less usually after others).

1.2.5. Sahidic employs a specific "temporal" clause conjugation, tripartite pattern form (ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲉϥ(ⲧⲙ)ⲥⲱⲧⲙ) distinct from the second and relative perfect forms.

1.2.6. The negatived conditional conjugation form has in Sahidic two variants (alternants), namely ⲉϥϣⲁⲛⲧⲙⲥⲱⲧⲙ and ⲉϥⲧⲙⲥⲱⲧⲙ.

1.2.7. A special prenominal allomorph of all converters and some tripartite conjugation bases is characterized by the ending -ⲣⲉ.

1.2.8. Verbs of Greek origin occur in Sahidic in a zero-stem form (usually identical with the Greek imperative) and are directly incorporated in the conjugation and generally grammatical forms without the intermediation of an auxiliary: ⲁⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ, ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲛⲉⲣⲅⲉⲓ, ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ (imperative/infinitive).

1.2.9. The verb ⲓ, give, has in *S* two imperatives, ⲓ and ⲙⲁ (Polotsky, 1950, pp. 76ff., 1971, pp. 211ff.).

1.2.10. Pronominals: Sahidic has a ternary determination category—definite, indefinite, and zero ({ⲡ}, {ⲟⲩ·}, Ø-) determinators, expanded by noun lexemes. The proclitic form of the demonstrative ⲡⲏ, namely ⲡⲓ-, has (wherever distinct from ⲡⲉⲓ-, the proclitic allomorph of ⲡⲁⲓ) affective and specially designative value (Polotsky, 1957a, pp. 229ff., 1971, pp. 231ff.).

1.2.11. Numbers are expressed as a rule by number words, not letters (e.g., Acts 23:23).

1.2.12. The first-person singular suffix-pronoun -ⲓ has the allomorphs -ⲁ- (ⲛⲛ-ⲁ-, ⲧⲣ-ⲁ-) and -ⲧ (as object of infinitives following a consonant or /X/ or prepositions in similar environments). The second-person singular feminine suffix-pronoun consists of the allomorphs -Ø-/-ⲣⲉ after conjugation bases -Ø-/-ⲉ-/-ⲧⲉ as object of infinitives. The second-person plural suffix-pronoun consists of the allomorphs -ⲧⲛ- and -ⲧⲉⲧⲛ-. The third-person plural suffix-pronoun is nonsyllabic after ⲛⲛⲉ-, ⲧⲣⲉ-, ⲛⲉ- (possessive article). A special objective pronoun-paradigm is characterized by the third-person plural term -ⲥⲉ/-ⲥⲟⲩ. (This paradigm occurs mostly after another pronoun, e.g., as pronominal object of the possession verboid ⲟⲩⲛⲧⲁϥ.)

1.2.13. ⲙⲓⲛ- forms in Sahidic lexical (nongrammatical) action nouns.

1.3 Syntagmatics and Prosody.

1.3.1. Focalization patterns: The second tense focalizes in Sahidic not only adverbials but also actor and object (pro)nouns, and may even be autofocal, that is, with the verb lexeme or predicative adverb itself the information focus (see Polotsky, 1944, pp. 51ff., 1971, pp. 155ff., 1960 sec. 32 obs., 1971, pp. 408ff., as in Lk. 20:13, ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲣ ⲟⲩ, "What shall I do?"; Sir. 5:4, ⲛⲧⲁⲟⲩ ⲫⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ, "What has happened to me?"; Acts 12:15, ⲉⲣⲉⲗⲟⲃⲉ, "Thou art mad"; Ps. 67:28, ⲉϥⲏⲙⲁⲩ, "Ibi est"). The cleft sentence with (pro)nominal focus (*vedette*; Polotsky, 1962) has the form "(pro)noun-ⲡⲉⲧ- (etc.)," with the *glose* marker ⲡ- tending to be invariable, and omissible only after a personal-pronoun focus (Polotsky, 1962, p. 420, 1971, p. 421).

1.3.2. Nominal syntagmatics: The nominal expansion of a noun syntagm is effected by ⲡ-/ⲛⲧⲉ- regulated by the determination of the nuclear noun and/or other expansions thereof, apparently with no lexical considerations involved.

1.3.3. -ⲙⲛ- is limited to coordinating non-zero-determinated nouns; the range of ⲁⲩⲱ is accordingly extended. (Zero-determinated nouns are coordinated by means of -ϩⲓ-.)

1.3.4. After converters, an indefinite or zero-determinated actor noun does not necessarily condition a ⲟⲩⲛ-/ⲙⲛ- allotagm of the bipartite pattern (Polotsky, 1960, sec. 21 and 35).

1.3.5. Final clauses are expressed by the conjunctions ϫⲉ, ϫⲉⲕⲁ(ⲗ)ⲥ followed by future III or the second future (circ. negative future III following ϫⲉⲕⲁⲁⲥ; Polotsky, 1957a, p. 233, 1971, p. 233) and not by means of the conjunctive (which does, however, resume ϫⲉⲕⲁⲁⲥ after an interposition; Lefort, 1948). The *S* conjuctive occurs after a limited number of conjunctions (the consecutive ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ and ⲙⲏⲡⲱⲥ [ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲧⲉ], both of Greek origin) and does not usually function as a "that" form or expand impersonal verb predications (Stern, 1880, p. 275, sec. 445).

1.3.6. The possession-predicating ⲟⲩⲛⲧⲁϥ and ⲙⲛⲧⲁϥ have in Sahidic verboid status—that is, partake of all syntactic properties of verbal predications (conjugation forms): the *possessum* may be expressed pronominally as an object adjacent of the pronominal possessor (Acts 3:6, ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲟⲩⲛⲧⲁⲓϥ, "that which I have"; see ibid., sec. 316).

1.3.7. Prosody: Prosodic proclitic weakness is consistently reflected in the standard *S* orthography (see Erman, 1915: ⲟⲩⲛ-/ⲙⲛ-; ⲁⲛ-/ⲛⲧⲕ . . . ; ⲡⲉⲓ-; ⲟⲩⲛⲧϥ-; ⲥ†-; etc.). The relative converter joins in Sahidic in close juncture with the converted conju-

gation form (e.g., Lk. 12:5). Vowel reduplication occurs sporadically in monosyllabic, final-laryngeal words before an enclitic (ⲟⲩⲏⲉⲉ ⲛⲉ; Polotsky, 1957a, p. 231, 1971, p. 232, 1957b, pp. 348ff., 1971, pp. 390ff.).

1.4 Lexicon. As a rule, Sahidic shares lexical isoglosses at least with Akhmimic and/or Lycopolitan (or Subakhmimic), such as ⲃⲱⲣⲉ, push, protrude. (This, however, may be refuted by further, more sophisticated investigation.) Lexemes not occurring in Bohairic seem relatively more common than exclusive *S* + *B* ones (e.g., ⲫⲱⲱⲥⲉ, wound; ⲃⲱⲕ, go; ⲧⲱⲕ, throw; ϩⲱⲛ, approach; ⲡⲱⲱⲛⲉ, turn; ⲕⲱⲙⲟ̄, sneer; ⲟⲩⲱϣ̄, answer; ϩⲱⲱⲩ (particle), on the other hand; ϫⲟⲟⲩ-ⲧⲛⲛⲟⲟⲩ, send). Relatively few conjunctions of Greek origin are found in Sahidic.

2. Varieties of Sahidic

2.1 Classical, or Scriptural, Sahidic. As a rule, classical Sahidic conforms to the standard described above. However, more-precise scanning is called for in this case, differentiating between the Old and New Testaments, between various parts thereof, and even between the various manuscripts. Sahidic boasts more early (fourth or fifth century) manuscript sources than any other dialect of Coptic, and in this corpus many idiosyncrasies are observable, which may be subsumed together under the heading of "early Sahidic." The grouping of manuscripts in this category is helpful: the British Library Deuteronomy-Jonah and Psalms (Budge, 1898, 1912); the Bodmer Papyri, complemented by Chester Beatty and University of Mississippi fragments (Kasser, 1961, 1962, 1964, 1965) with linguistic introductions (note the forms ⲛⲁⲉ, ⲛⲅⲁⲣ; ⲛϯ-, with; the rarity of the preterite relative prefix ⲉⲣ-, Dt. 4:42; total assimilation of nasals to sonorants; omission of nasals, etc.); the Turin Wisdoms (de Lagarde, 1883); the Berlin Psalter (Rahlfs, 1901); and recently the Palau Ribes Gospels (Quecke 1972, 1977; note the idiosyncrasies pointed out in the editor's extraordinary introductions: ⲛⲏ-, ⲙⲁϥ- (negative aorist), ⲧⲏⲛⲟⲩ second-person plural object, variation of ⲉⲧⲉ- ~ ⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉ-, ⲧⲉϥ- ~ ⲧⲣⲉϥ, sporadic omission of adverbial ⲛ- (ⲧⲉⲩⲛⲟⲩ, ⲥⲁ, ⲟⲩⲱⲧ), even some special lexemes). See in general Kahle's (1954, p. 233) discussion of this kind of manuscript; "Old Coptic" similarly presents mainly Sahidic traits (ibid., pp. 242ff., 252ff.).

2.2 "Gnostic" Sahidic. One must distinguish here between the Gnostic texts with no special dialectological problem (the Pistis Sophia, the Bruce Codex, some of the Nag Hammadi tractates) and such Nag Hammadi tractates as exhibit non-Sahidic traits. The former group conforms by and large to the early-Sahidic type, with some idiosyncrasies (total nasal assimilation, ⲉⲣ- relative prefix, ⲛⲧⲁⲣⲉϥ- for the classic ⲧⲁⲣⲉϥ-, ⲁ-future ⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛ-, ϩⲉⲱⲥ ⲫⲁ(ⲛⲧⲉ-) [PS 178f., 313]), perhaps a more pronounced tendency to resume a converter/conjugation base after a nominal extraposition (PS 31, 173, 275f., 320). A profile of the Nag Hammadi idiom(s) or idiolect(s) will eventually be achieved on the basis of a series of monographs (cf. Nagel, 1969; Layton, 1973, 1974). The Nag Hammadi grammatical systems, which vary from one text to another, often seem inconsistent even in one and the same text. One encounters tractates written by a "speaker of some form of dialect A^2" (Layton, 1974, p. 379, Codex II). Certain texts (notably in codices III, V, and especially VII, tractates 2, 3, and 5) reveal Bohairic or "Middle Egyptian" (morpho-)syntactic traits, e.g., open juncture of the relative converter (III, 42.5f.), interrogative pronouns before basic tenses (VII, 103.3f.), the conjunctive a "that" form (VII, 80.13, 99.29f.), the relative compatible with indefinite determinators (ϩⲉⲛ-ⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ, VII, 85. 11f.), relative conversion of the future III (III, 114.2f.), and, most striking, a four-term determination category with consequences for the expansion of the noun syntagm (ⲡⲓ- ⲛⲧⲉ-). Codices II and V reflect early Sahidic with non-Sahidic traits, mostly Akhmimoid (*A*, *L*, and, in the case of Codex V, Middle Egyptian as well). Note the following ⲗ-coloring in varying ratios: *A* forms of lexemes and morphs (ϩⲙⲁⲥⲧ, ⲕⲱⲉ, ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥⲉ, ⲧⲫⲱⲛ, ϫⲟⲩ); lexical Akhmimicisms (e.g., ϩⲣⲧⲉ, fear; ⲗⲗⲟⲉ, cease [also Pistis Sophia]; ⲧⲁⲛⲟ, make, create); ⲙⲛ- ~ ⲙⲡⲣ- (negative imper.); ⲣ ~ ∅- with Greek loan-verbs; ⲡ- ~ ⲡⲉ- for the definite article before a consonant cluster; ⲡⲉ- (possessive article second singular feminine), ⲡⲟⲩ-, ⲧⲣⲟⲩ- (third plural); the perfects ⲁϩⲁ-, ⲁϩ〃, ⲉⲧⲁϩ-, ϩⲁϥ-.

2.3 Nonliterary, Postclassical, and Late Sahidic. These terms, often confused (if only by implication), demand clear definition. On the one hand, there are late literary texts, especially hagiographical, martyrological, and liturgical, but also popular literature and poetry (Drescher, 1947; Till, 1935–1936; Erman, 1897; Junker, 1908; etc.), mostly posterior to the Arab conquest. This corpus has to be carefully distinguished from the extremely important one, of high standardization, of postclassical literary Sahidic of the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries (note espe-

cially Pachomius' writings and, above everything, the linguistic usage in Shenute's works, considered by the present writer at least as significant for the description of Sahidic grammar as is the scriptural idiom).

On the other hand, there is the immense body of nonliterary sources of late documentation, largely overlapping the late-*S* corpus in its grammatical norm. This category includes letters (private, formal, official), documents (receipts, contracts and agreements, demands, testaments), magical and medical recipes and spells (see, e.g., Chassinat, 1921), and so on. This corpus has had very scant attention hitherto (see Crum, 1926, Vol. I, chap. 10; Kahle, 1954, chap. 8), and grammatical investigation of this area is still a future goal—perhaps the greatest challenge before Coptic linguistics today.

The overpowering impression conveyed by these texts, apart from their sheer numbers (major collections have been found at Thebes, al-Ashmūnayn, Wādī Sarjah, Dayr al-Bala'izah, Armant, and Aphrodito), is their bewildering variety and degrees of deviation from the classical standard; but therein lies their value. The letters (eighth–eleventh centuries in all catalogic collections, e.g., the British Library and the John Rylands Library ones, by Crum; Berlin, by Satzinger; Vienna, by Krall and Till) and documentary legal texts (again, in most collections) are to a large extent characterized by formulas. The poetic (tenth–eleventh centuries), magical (seventh–tenth centuries; Kropp, 1930–1931; Stegemann, 1934), and liturgical (see Quecke, 1970, pp. 350–89, M 574, a ninth-century manuscript) all to a lesser or greater extent exhibit non-Sahidic characteristics (Akhmimoid, Fayyumic, Bohairic). Striking are the following traits:

Phonological (if not dialectal) *and orthographic:* Vocalic and (to a lesser extent) consonantal variation is common; note especially the vocalic (ϵ-) treatment of syllabic nasals (ⲙϵ-, with; ϵⲧⲟϥ, he) and the fluctuations ϵ ~ ⲁ, ϵ ~ ⲏ ~ ∅, ⲟ ~ ⲱ, ϭ ~ ⲕ, ⲃ ~ ⲫ, voiced ~ unvoiced, aspirated ~ unaspirated. Many magical texts show Fayyumicism (stressed ⲁ for ⲟ, ϵ for ⲁ, ⲏ for ϵ and even ∅, and ⲃ for ⲫ), although some (e.g., Kropp's A and B) are pure standard Sahidic; so on the whole is the Bala'izah collection. Some texts (e.g., Till's Martyrdoms) show a mixture of the *S* superlineation and Bohairic DJINKIM. Observe that incomplete or hesitant standardization must on no account be taken for "misspelling" (cf. Kahle, 1954, p. 254, n. 5; Kahle's lists [chap. 8] constitute an unsurpassed, indeed unparalleled description of the phonologic-orthographic usage of the Theban nonliterary sources).

Morphological. First-person singular ⲫⲁⲛⲧⲁ-; second plural ⲧⲉⲧⲛϵ- (Theban); second singular feminine ϵⲣ- (converter), ⲁⲣ- (perfect) (Polotsky, 1960, p. 422, obs. 1); ⲛⲫⲁϥ-, relative aorist, ⲛϵ- future (*F*); ⲧϵϥ- conjunctive (especially Theban, but also elsewhere; also ⲛⲧϵϥ-); ϵϥⲁ- future, ⲟⲩⲁ- future base, ⲙⲡ(ⲧ)- conditional (all Theban); verb lexeme sporadically unreduced before the direct nominal object; verb-lexeme morphology—(Theban) ⲟⲩⲁⲫϵ, ⲙⲟⲩⲛϵ, ⲧⲓ⸗.

Tempuslehre and syntax. A future-eventual use of ⲫⲁϥ-; a final-"subjunctive" use of the conjunctive (e.g., Martyrdoms 1.8.1, Ryl. 290, 321, also Theb., Kahle, 1954, pp. 160ff.), also in a "that"-form role, as direct object (Martyrdoms 1.5.9), even with past tenses; future final-consecutive use of ⲧⲁⲣϵϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ (Ryl. 316, Martyrdoms 1.5.29, Epiph. 162.26); ⲫⲁⲛⲧϥ- (also final) and ϫϵⲕⲁⲁⲥ acquire the value of content-clauses (cf. *ἵνα*). The second tense is used as a "that" form outside the cleft sentence (BKU 335 ⲁ ⲛϵⲛⲥⲟⲛ ⲧⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲁϭⲛⲧϥ, "Our brother has told me that you found him." The circumstantial occurs adnominally, attributive to a definite nucleus (Kropp D 20 ⲡⲛⲟϭ ⲛⲁϵⲧⲟⲥ ϵⲣϵ ⲛϵϥⲧⲛ̄ⲥ ⲡⲟⲣϣ̄ ϵϧⲟⲗ, "The great eagle whose wings are spread"); the circumstantial as *glose* in a cleft sentence (Kropp D ⲧⲟⲕ ⲡϵ ϵⲕ† ⲥⲙ̄ ⲡⲁⲡⲟⲧ, "It is you who pour"); the possessive ⲉⲡⲱ⸗ ⲡϵ (e.g., Ryl. 325, 341), also ⲡⲱ⸗ as an augens of the possessive article ⲡϵϥ- (KRU 36 ⲧⲛⲁⲓⲧⲏⲥⲓⲥ ⲧⲱⲛ ⲛⲙⲓⲛ ⲛⲙⲟⲛ). Note such Bohairic-like features as ⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲧⲁϥ- (Martyrdoms 1.58.1, a generic relative, an indefinite ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϥ-), ⲛⲧⲁϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ (relative/second perfect) used as a temporal clause, ⲛⲓⲙ ⲁϥ- (Martyrdoms 1.3.7); also ⲛⲥⲁ- ⲛⲧⲟϥ (ibid. 1.34.3).

2.4 Sahidic Alloyed with Other Dialects (cf. Crum's S^{e} and S^{f}). This is, in view of the reservations and observations made above, to be understood as an ad hoc text-specific descriptive appellation (IDIOLECT) rather than a clear, definable dialectological phonomenon. The quality and degree of component admixture vary considerably from one case to another, and it is doubtful whether dialectologically meaningful classification and gradation are at all feasible. For instance, the Fayyumicisms peculiar to many *S* manuscripts in the Morgan collection are neither predictable nor uniformly distributed. In "Pseudo-Shenute," M 604 (Kuhn, 1960), the *F* element consists of sporadic grammatical characteristics -ⲫⲧϵⲙ-, negative conditional ⲁⲣϵⲫⲧϵⲙ-, second singular feminine possessive article ⲡⲉⲣ-, and lexical-phonological

Fayyumicisms: ϣⲟⲓⲧ, ⲟⲩⲛ, what (interrogative). In the unpublished parallel source, B. L. Or. 12689, the vocalism and generally the phonological shape of words is drastically affected.

3. Bibliographical Information

3.1 Major, Comprehensive, or Authoritative Bible Editions. Old Testament: de Lagarde, 1883 (Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus); Ciasca, 1885–1904 (Old Testament fragments, a basic edition); Maspero, 1892–1897 (a complementary edition of Old Testament fragments); Budge, 1898 and 1912 (Psalms, Deuteronomy, Jonah); Rahlfs, 1901 (Psalms); Thompson, 1908 (Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus) and 1911 (Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Judith, Esther); Worrell, 1931 (Proverbs); Shier, 1942 (Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, fragments of Genesis, Jeremiah, Baruch); Kasser, 1961, 1962, 1964, and 1965 (the Bodmer manuscripts: Exodus, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Epistle of Jeremiah, Baruch). New Testament: Horner, 1911–1924 (authoritative critical edition of the New Testament); Balestri in Ciasca and Balestri, 1885–1904, Vol. 3 (Borgia New Testament fragments); Budge, 1912 (Acts, Revelation); Thompson, 1932 (Acts, Pauline Epistles); Kasser, 1962 (Matthew, Romans); Quecke, 1972, 1977, and 1984 (Mark, Luke, John).

3.2 Grammars and Grammatical Monographs. Stern, 1880 (best grammar yet); Steindorff, 1894, 1904 (reprint 1930), and 1921; Till, 1961 (still the most commonly used, for its convenience rather than for descriptive merit); Plumley, 1948, and Walters, 1972, are rather sketchy. Dialect comparative grammars: Stern 1880; Till, 1961; Chaîne, 1933 (very detailed); Steindorff, 1951; Vergote, 1973b, Vol. 1a. Special studies: Erman, 1897; Levy, 1909; Wilson, 1970; Kickasola, 1975.

3.3 Dictionaries. There is no special Sahidic lexicon, but the Sahidic component of Crum's *Dictionary* (also Spiegelberg and Westendorff's *Handwörterbuch*) is certainly adequate. Wilmet's invaluable *Concordance* (1957–1959) covers the Sahidic New Testament. Many text editions include special glossaries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Balestri, G. *Sacrorum Bibliorum Fragmenta Copto-Sahidica Musei Borgiani.* Vol. 3, *Novum Testamentum.* Rome, 1904. See also Ciasca, A.

Budge, E. A. W. *The Earliest Known Coptic Psalter.* London, 1898.

———. *Coptic Biblical Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt.* London, 1912.

Chaîne, M. *Eléments de grammaire dialectale copte.* Paris, 1933.

Chassinat, E. *Un Papyrus médical copte.* Cairo, 1921.

Ciasca, A. *Sacrorum Bibliorum Fragmenta Copto-sahidica Musei Borgiani Iussu et Sumptibus S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Studio . . . Edita.* Vols. 1 and 2. Rome, 1885 and 1889. And [without author or ed.]: *SS. Bibliorum Fragmenta Copto-Sahidica Musei Borgiani. Vol. 1–2. Tabulae.* Rome, [1904]. See also Balestri, G.

Crum, W. E. "The Language of the Texts." In *The Monastery of Epiphanius at Thebes,* Part 1, *The Archaeological Material by H. E. Winlock, The Literary Material by W. E. Crum,* pp. 232–56. New York, 1926.

———. *A Coptic Dictionary.* Oxford, 1939.

Drescher, J. *Three Coptic Legends.* Cairo, 1947.

Erman, A. *Bruchstücke koptischer Volksliteratur.* Berlin, 1897.

———. "Unterschiede zwischen den koptischen Dialekten bei der Wortverbindung." *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1 (1915):161–72.

[Horner, G. W.] *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect, Otherwise Called Sahidic and Thebaic.* Oxford, 1911–1924.

Junker, H. *Koptische Poesie des 10. Jahrhunderts.* Berlin, 1908.

Kahle, P. E. *Bala'izah: Coptic Texts from Deir el-Bala'izah in Upper Egypt.* Oxford and London, 1954.

Kasser, R. *Papyrus Bodmer VI: livre des Proverbes.* CSCO 194–195. Louvain, 1960.

———. *Papyrus Bodmer XVI: Exode I–XV,21 en sahidique.* Cologny/Geneva, 1961.

———. *Papyrus Bodmer XVIII, Deutéronome I–X,7 en sahidique.* Cologny/Geneva, 1962.

———. *Papyrus Bodmer XXII et Mississippi Coptic Codex II: Jérémie XL,3–LII,34, Lamentations, Epitre de Jérémie, Baruch I,1–V,5, en sahidique.* Cologny/Geneva, 1964.

———. *Papyrus Bodmer XXIII: Esaïe XLVII–LXVI, en sahidique.* Cologny/Geneva, 1965.

———. "Prolégomènes à un essai de classification systématique des dialectes et subdialectes coptes selon les critères de la phonétique. I, Principes et terminologie." *Muséon* 93 (1980a):53–112. ". . . , II, Alphabets et systèmes phonétiques." *Muséon* 93 (1980b):237–97. ". . . , III, Systèmes orthographiques et catégories dialectales." *Muséon* 94 (1981):91–152.

Kickasola, J. N. *Sahidic Coptic (ϧ) . . . ⲁⲛ Negation Patterns: A Morpho-syntactic Description of Sentences and Adjuncts.* Ann Arbor, Mich., 1975.

Kropp, A. M. *Ausgewählte koptische Zaubertexte.* Brussels, 1930–1931.

Kuhn, K. H. *Pseudo-Shenoute on Christian Behaviour.* CSCO 206–207. Louvain, 1960.

Lagarde, P. A. de. *Aegyptiaca.* Göttingen, 1883.

Layton, B. "The Text and Orthography of the Coptic Hypostasis of the Archons." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 11 (1973):173–200.

———. "The Hypostasis of the Archons or the Reality of the Rulers: A Gnostic Story of the Creation, Fall, and Ultimate Salvation of Man, and the Origin and Reality of His Enemies, Newly Edited from the Cairo Manuscript with a Preface, English Translation, Notes, and Indexes." *Harvard Theological Review* 67 (1974):352–425; 69 (1976):31–101. Particularly "Preface," 67 (1974):351–94.

Lefort, L. T. "ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ dans le NT sahidique." *Muséon* 61 (1948):65–73.

Levy, A. *Die Syntax der koptischen Apophthegmata Patrum Aegyptiorum.* Berlin, 1909.

Maspero, G. *Fragments de la version thébaine de l'Ancien Testament.* Mémoires de l'Institut français d'Archéologie orientale 6. Cairo, 1892–1897.

Mink, G. "Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft und Koptologie." In *The Future of Coptic Studies,* ed. R. McL. Wilson, pp. 71–103. Leiden, 1978.

Nagel, P. "Der frühkoptische Dialekt von Theben." in *Koptologische Studien in der DDR,* pp. 30–49. *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg,* Sonderheft. Halle-Wittenberg, 1965.

———. "Grammatische Untersuchungen zu Nag H. Codex II." In *Die Araber in der alten Welt,* ed. F. Altheim and R. Stiehl, Vol. 5, *Nachträge, Das christliche Aksūm.* Berlin, 1969.

Peyron, V. A. *Grammatica Linguae Coptae.* Turin, 1841.

Plumley, J. M. *An Introductory Coptic Grammar (Sahidic Dialect).* London, 1948.

Polotsky, H. J. "Zur koptischen Lautlehre II." *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 69 (1933):125–29. Repr. in *Collected Papers,* pp. 358–62. Jerusalem, 1971.

———. *Etudes de syntaxe copte.* Cairo, 1934. Repr. in *Collected Papers,* pp. 102–207. Jerusalem, 1971.

———. "Modes grecs en copte?" In *Coptic Studies in Honor of W. E. Crum,* pp. 73–90. Boston, 1950. Repr. in *Collected Papers,* pp. 208–225. Jerusalem, 1971.

———. Review of W. C. Till, *Koptische Grammatik (saïdischer Dialekt). Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 52 (1957a):219–34. Repr. in *Collected Papers,* pp. 226–33. Jerusalem, 1971.

———. "Zu den koptischen literarischen Texten aus Balaizah." *Orientalia* 26 (1957b):347–49. Repr. in *Collected Papers,* pp. 389–91. Jerusalem, 1971.

———. "The Coptic Conjugation System." *Orientalia* 29 (1960):392–422. Repr. in *Collected Papers,* pp. 238–68. Jerusalem, 1971.

———. "Nominalsatz und Cleft Sentence im Koptischen." *Orientalia* 31 (1962):413–30. Repr. in *Collected Papers,* pp. 418–35. Jerusalem, 1971.

———. "Coptic." In *Current Trends in Linguistics,* Vol. 6, *South West Asia and North Africa,* ed. T. A. Sebeok, pp. 558–70. The Hague, 1970.

Quecke, H. *Untersuchungen zum koptischen Stundengebet.* Louvain, 1970.

———. *Das Markusevangelium saidisch: Text der Handschrift PPalau Rib. Inv.-Nr. 182 mit den Varianten der Handschrift M 569.* Barcelona, 1972.

———. *Das Lukasevangelium saidisch: Text der Handschrift PPalau Rib. Inv.-Nr. 181 mit den Varianten der Handschrift M 569.* Barcelona, 1977.

———. *Das Johannesevangelium saidisch: Text der Handschrift PPalau Rib. Inv.-Nr. 183 mit den Varianten der Handschriften 813 und 814 der Chester Beatty Library und der Handschrift M 569.* Rome and Barcelona, 1984.

Rahlfs, A. *Die Berliner Handschrift des sahidischen Psalters.* Berlin, 1901.

Satzinger, H. "Phonologie des koptischen Verbs (sa'idischer Dialekt)." In *Festschrift E. Edel, 12 März 1979,* pp. 343–68. Bamberg, 1979.

Schenke, H.-M. Review of Joseph Vergote, *Grammaire copte. Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 76 (1981):345–51.

Shier, L. A. "Old Testament Texts on Vellum." In William H. Worrell. *Coptic Texts in the University of Michigan Collection,* pp. 23–167. Ann Arbor, Mich., 1942.

Stegemann, V. *Die koptischen Zaubertexte der Sammlung Erzherzog Rainer in Wien.* Heidelberg, 1934.

Steindorff, G. *Koptische Grammatik.* Berlin, 1894.

———. *Koptische Grammatik.* Berlin, 1904. Repr. Berlin, 1930.

———. *Kurzer Abriss der koptischen Grammatik.* Berlin, 1921.

———. *Lehrbuch der koptischen Grammatik.* Chicago, 1951.

Stern, L. *Koptische Grammatik.* Leipzig, 1880.

Thompson, H. *The Coptic (Sahidic) Version of Certain Books of the Old Testament from a Papyrus in the British Museum.* London, 1908.

———. *A Coptic Palimpsest Containing Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Judith and Esther in the Sahidic Dialect.* Oxford, 1911.

———. *The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles in the Sahidic Dialect.* Cambridge, 1932.

Till, W. C. *Koptische Heiligen- und Martyrerlegenden.* Rome, 1935–1936.

———. *Koptische Grammatik (saïdischer Dialekt), mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnissen.* Leipzig, 1955.

——— *Koptische Dialektgrammatik, mit Lesestücken und Wörterbuch.* 2nd ed. Munich, 1961.

Vergote, J. "Le dialecte copte P (P. Bodmer VI: Proverbes), essai d'identification." *Revue d'égyptologie* 25 (1973a):50–57.

——— *Grammaire copte,* Vol. 1a, *Introduction, phonétique et phonologie, morphologie synthématique (structure des sémantèmes), partie synchronique,* Vol. 1b, *Introduction, phonétique et phonologie, morphologie synthématique (structure des sémantèmes), partie diachronique.* Louvain, 1973b.

Walters, C. C. *An Elementary Coptic Grammar of the Sahidic Dialect.* Oxford, 1972.

Wilmet, M. *Concordance du Nouveau Testament sahidique,* II, *Les Mots autochthones.* CSCO 173, 183, 185. Louvain, 1957–1959.

Wilson, M. R. *Coptic Future Tenses: Syntactical Studies in Sahidic.* The Hague, 1970.

Worrell, W. H. *The Proverbs of Solomon in Sahidic Coptic According to the Chicago Manuscript.* Chicago, 1931.

——— *Coptic Sounds.* Ann Arbor, Mich., 1934.

ARIEL SHISHA-HALEVY

SHENUTEAN IDIOM. "Shenutean Coptic" is the term applied to the idiom, including the grammatical norm and stylistic-phraseological usage, observable in the corpus of writing by the archimandrite Apa Shenute (334–451), outstanding among Coptic literary sources in that it constitutes the single most extensive homogenous and authentic *testo di lingua* for Sahidic and Coptic in general. This corpus provides the linguist with a precious opportunity to achieve a consistent and complete description of a grammatical system. The other extensive corpus, that of the Scriptures, although somewhat earlier and so enjoying the prestige of a "classical" *état de langue,* has the disadvantage of being translated from the Greek; its native Coptic constituent element can be properly determined only after a complete structural description of the grammatical system of its *Vorlage,* precise knowledge of the quality and degree of its dependence upon this *Vorlage,* and diacritical-contrastive application of an independent, untranslated grammatical system such as that abstractable from Shenute's works. The desirability of such a grammar makes an early analysis of this corpus of paramount importance.

Compilation of the Corpus

Although only slightly more than half of all known or surmised Shenute sources have been edited to date (1982), there is no great difficulty about compiling most of the extant corpus: the task of isolating unattributed Shenute fragments from the host of homiletic and rhetoric-epistolary ones is largely technical. Linguistic (grammatical and stylistic-phraseological) data extractable from the unambiguously Shenutean sources in the three major editions (Amélineau, 1907–1914; Leipoldt and Crum, 1908–1913; Chassinat, 1911) and the many minor ones—mostly in catalogic collections (by Crum, Munier, Pleyte-Boeser, Rossi, Wessely, and Zoega) and occasionally in special publications (e.g., by Guérin, Lefort, Teza, Young, and the present writer), as well as unpublished sources—serve as probes for locating other sources. Identification on the basis of stylistic impression alone, although certainly unavoidable as a practical guide, is not always adequate, especially when the style is untypically pedestrian rather than in the usual powerful, involved vein. The main unedited collections of Sinuthiana are those in Paris and Vienna repositories and in British libraries (Oxford, Cambridge, and Manchester).

Linguistic Characterization

Shenute's dialect is what is conventionally conceived of as high-standard literary Sahidic, albeit with distinct Akhmimoid traces (Shisha-Halevy, 1976a), which are probably due to his native Akmimic background and consist mainly of (morpho)-phonologic, morphologic, idiomatic, and lexical features, with more elisive syntactic affinities. (Present-day knowledge of Akhmimic syntax is notoriously inadequate, because of insufficient evidence.) Some of the more striking phenomena in Shenute's grammatical usage are the idiosyncratic use of the conjunctive and of object constructions and the favoring of one of the "mediators" or lexeme premodifiers (ϯ ⲥⲟⲩⲉ-, ϯ ⲡⲕⲉ-, ⲫϯⲛ (ⲛ)-). Note two (of several) distinctive nominal-sentence patterns, namely # Ø ·ⲛⲉ # (e.g., Leipoldt, 1908–1913, IV, 23.22, ⲛⲕⲁ₂ ⲛ₂ⲏⲧ ⲛⲉ ⲥⲱⲧⲛ ⲉⲛⲉⲩⲫⲁⲭⲉ; Amélineau 1907–1914, I, 228, ⲫⲁⲟⲩ ⲛⲉ ⲭⲟⲟⲩ, ⲫⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲉ ⲥⲱⲧⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ) and a hyperbatic construction with a demonstrative subject (Chassinat, 1911, 150.3ff., ⲛⲛⲟⲩ₂ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲥⲱⲗⲙ, "These are 'the cords which broke'"); ⲭⲉ, used adnominally (ibid., 125.38ff., ⲙⲛⲛ ⲟⲉⲙⲓⲥⲧⲓⲥ, ⲙⲛⲛ ⲟⲉ₂ⲉⲗⲡⲓⲥ ⲛ₂ⲱⲃ ⲛⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲛ ⲭⲉ ⲛⲧⲫⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲥ ⲁⲛ, "There is no faith, there is no hope of goodness that does not belong to it").

As regards the use of the second tenses, one finds numerous distinctive figures and constellations variously combining topicalizations and foci. Striking is the cleft sentence with the circumstantial topic